

**U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND
INFORMATION SCIENCE**

APRIL 12, 2002

U.S. National Commission on Libraries
and Information Science
1111 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 820
Washington, D.C. 20005

A T T E N D A N C E

Commissioners

Martha Gould, Chairperson

Joan Challinor, Vice-Chair

Winston Tabb

José-Marie Griffiths

Mary Chute (for Robert Martin)

Rebecca Bingham

Jack Hightower

Staff

Robert Willard, Executive Director

Judith Russell, Deputy Director

Observers:

Nancy Bolt

Peyton Neal

Carmin Trotta

Denise Davis

Lynne Bradley

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:00 a.m.)

MS. CHALLINOR: Why don't you call the roll, Martha?

MS. GOULD: Well, this is Martha Gould, and Joan Challinor.

MS. CHALLINOR: Here.

MS. GOULD: Rebecca.

MS. BINGHAM: Here.

MS. GOULD: Winston.

MR. TABB: Here.

MS. GOULD: Jack.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Here.

MS. GOULD: Judy.

MS. RUSSELL: Here.

MS. GOULD: Bob.

MR. WILLARD: Here.

MS. GOULD: Denise. I don't know who that is.

MS. DAVIS: Here.

MS. GOULD: José-Marie Griffiths.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Here.

MR. NEAL: Peyton Neal from SIA.

MR. TROTTA: Carmine Trotter.

MS. RUSSELL: And Mary Chute is here for Bob Martin from MCLIS, and Lynne Bradley is also here from LAA.

MS. GOULD: Welcome. I think we're going to get started immediately. It is a beautiful sunny day in Reno, Nevada, and my daffodils are springing up all over the backyard, so with that I would like to go directly to the executive director's report. Bob.

MR. WILLARD: I thought I could wait until 10 after 10.

(Laughter.)

MS. GOULD: We're used to moving ahead, and please, when you speak, remember to identify yourself.

MR. WILLARD: I'm Bob Willard, and also I would like to suggest that although we do have a timetable that is just suggested times, we probably will be able to wrap this up sooner than 2 hours. Four things under the executive director's report, and because of the nature of this conference call this is nothing, no Power Point slides or anything.

Although you have received some documents in advance, like the appropriations hearing, and the LSTA testimony, the status on the appropriations is that nothing has been formally done on either the House or Senate side. In conversations on the Senate side it looks like they will not even have a budget resolution, which provides the broad outline of what each Appropriations Committee is allowed to appropriate, and so there is already discussion that each committee, or subcommittee will be seeking more and more than traditionally they have.

We are at the point where we have got a good record established in the House. The hearing went extremely well. We have also brought the documents to the Senate and met with the Senate staff people.

MS. GOULD: And that's on Senate appropriations? This is Martha.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob, so that's where there's nothing visible happening, and that's normally the case with appropriations. There's still speculation, although only that, that they will try to get their work done by the end of September. That hasn't happened in a long time, but we do have an election coming up, and it is notable that in our case our Senate committee is the appropriations subcommittee. The chairperson of that is Tom Harkin, and he does have a tough race, so he may be more anxious than under normal circumstances to get the work done and to get back to Iowa.

Any questions about the appropriations?

MS. GOULD: No questions. Okay. Again, this is Martha. Bob, do you want to go on to the nomination of new commissioners?

MR. WILLARD: Yes. This will be really quick, nothing to report. There are still about a

dozen individuals who have made it known to the White House and made it known to me that they are interested in pursuing appointment, but the White House staffer who deals on this commission talked to me a while back, probably about 4 weeks now, and said that there would be no movement out of the White House until it was clear that the commission would continue.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. GRIFFITHS: This is José. I did touch base with Beth Fitzsimmons probably about 3 to 4 weeks ago now. She had received a couple of calls. She hadn't yet talked to the person, obviously, the actual personnel, but he definitely wanted to touch base with her and update her. She has not called me back to say what happened.

On a personal note, just so that you know, I have interviewed, and NCLIS is on my list of commissions that I would like to be on.

MR. HIGHTOWER: José, I'm having a hard time hearing you.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I have been interviewed by the White House for a position on the National Science Board, that they moved with that. If you remember, when I went and talked to the White House probably a year ago now about reappointment, they indicated to me that I should pick, that they were not going to reappoint on the same commitment, that was the first statement that they made, and I should pick others, and asked me to name four areas of interest.

I have consistently also ensured that NCLIS was on that list in order that they understand that that is still an interest, and this is still a body that we want to be repopulated, but they have not been in touch with me in any way vis-a-vis the commission, only vis-a-vis the other areas of interest that I expressed, so I just thought I would let you know that for the record, and I have not heard back from Beth as to whether she touched base with the young man who was talking to her.

MS. BINGHAM: Rebecca Bingham. I have a question. Is this an appropriate time for me to re-mention my interest to my Senator, Mitch McConnell, and to my Congressman?

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes. I will be contacting them this week.

MS. GOULD: By all means, Rebecca.

MS. BINGHAM: I will be contacting each one of them next week. I'm going over to see the Passion Play this week and won't be back until Sunday, over in Illinois, near Jean's old place.

MS. CHALLINOR: I have the feeling-- this is Joan Challinor-- that the White House must think it awfully odd that we never go and see them. We don't. I mean, here we are at a distance, we are under threat, so to speak, we have been zeroed out by the budget, but we never go and see them. We never touch base with them. I think it is odd. I think we ought to be speaking to somebody in the White House.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Face to face.

MS. RUSSELL: Do you mean in the office, the White House personnel?

MS. CHALLINOR: I think we ought to talk about who we ought to go and see, but I think this is awfully odd. Here we are, a governmental organization, we're under threat, and we never touch them. We never speak to them. I think they must think we're awfully odd.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Bob, there's a problem there. Do you want to sort of discuss that, because it is not quite that simple to go to the White House to talk to somebody, aside from the White House Office of Personnel, and we have been in touch with them.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, have we seen them?

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob. We did have a meeting over a year ago now, where we did a presentation on the vacancies and the indication of interest on the part of a few people that we knew of then. It was at that point that they learned that the commission was being zeroed out by the administration, and it was then that they used the term, there's no further action because it is in police, quote-unquote. I guess there's some part of personnel that focuses on policy, and the policy of the administration is that there shouldn't be a commission, and therefore they are not working on it.

I agree with Joan, I think anybody who has personal contacts in the White House ought to be exercising them. Unfortunately, I don't.

MS. RUSSELL: This is Judy. I did send an e-mail earlier this week to José, Joan, Martha, and Bob about the contact that I had in response to the letters that José and Joan had sent, and this will probably come up in another area, but it is an entre into the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the White House, which I think is helpful, and Bob has had one conversation with Governor Ridge about the possibility of the Trust and Terror, so it may be the Trust and Terror initiative becomes the vehicle that gives us a reason to talk with them, when at the moment they don't have a lot of reason to want to talk to us, so I think that may need to sort of come up when we go to the Trust and Terror issue.

But I think we need to leverage-- we have to give them a reason to talk with us, and I think that is the reason we can use to get ourselves in there.

MR. HIGHTOWER: This is Jack. I have a couple of contacts over there, except I feel that when their attitude basically would be, we know where you are and when we need you we'll call you, I don't want to be a pest. I don't want to be considered a nuisance, and I've talked to both of them, and just to go back and say, hey, we haven't heard from you lately, why, hell, there's a whole lot of people that they know personally that they can pick up the phone and call and just say how are you doing, old boy.

I'm just reluctant to go barging in to Carl Rover and say, hey, Carl, I haven't heard from you lately, I didn't get your Christmas card, I sure want you to remember that I'm on the library

commission. He knows that, and he knows of my interest, and I talked to him -- the last time I talked to him, I talked to him specifically about the library commission, and Margaret the same way.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, as long as somebody's been in there, I just think they ought to know that we are going on.

MR. HIGHTOWER: I think they know that, but I certainly don't want to feel like I'm an authority on this. I'm just here with my own personal feeling about going to see somebody that knows my address, and knows my interest, and whether I ought to go in there and say hey, here I am.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. I think my gut feeling at this point -- and I have to agree with Jack that they have a lot on their plate right now, and I would not want to be a pest. On the other hand, I also agree with Judy that Trust and Terror, I think that we can make the Brownie points at the White House, and until we know the status of our budget in terms of the Senate and the House, I am inclined just to work with the people that have contacted us from the White House regarding the work on Trust and Terror.

MR. TABB: This is Winston. I would like to ask a practical question, which is, at what point will we have a quorum problem, or will we ever have a quorum problem, and if we have it, should that be used to get some action? At least, what are the practical consequences of that? That is a series of questions that I'm asking the executive director.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Do you want to answer that one please, Bob?

MR. WILLARD: We are clearly without a quorum. We are operating under a Department of Justice interpretation of our legislation that says a quorum is eight individuals, and we have even on the commission. At our last meeting where we did have a quorum we passed a resolution enabling the executive committee to take ministerial action on behalf of the commission, so things like that, things like getting the payroll approved, if there are policy issues there we could do that, clearly, and we said this, I guess, in response to the question for the Appropriations Committee. There is no way that this commission would take a major new policy thrust initiative in some area with seven members, and soon to be five. There's just no way that we could say the national commission says the Government should be doing thus and so.

MS. RUSSELL: This is Judy. The pitch to the White House when we did meet with them, and in the budget appeal, and in the budget submission to OMB, was, this President has the opportunity to appoint as many as 10 commissioners, given the people who are in their extended year, and really take ownership of this commission and tie it to his administration, and so we have laid that out for them that normally when there is a new administration it takes a number of years to even get a majority on the commission because of tenure of prior commissioners, and that has not apparently resonated with anybody.

So you are quite right that it ought to be appealing. I mean, it ought to be a mechanism

that they could see as a way to integrate it into their education initiatives and other things, and we have tried to position ourselves that way, but it has not been accepted.

MS. CHALLINOR: This is Joan. Bob spoke about, when we are more certain about our budget. Couldn't that be September 30, couldn't it be November, so are we talking realities?

MR. WILLARD: It could be, and I would suggest that the clearest early indication we would have will be committee bills. Once the two committees, the House and Senate have agreed on legislation, depending on what the amount is and what the accompanying language is, we then are potentially in better circumstances.

If both the House and Senate independently reply that we have seen your material and we now believe what you say and we're going to appropriate the \$2.8 million you ask for, I think we would be in a great position.

MS. CHALLINOR: And when would that be?

MR. WILLARD: Based upon what I reported earlier this morning, we don't know. It could be before September 30, it may not be. Nobody's tea leaves are good on that.

MS. RUSSELL: This is Judy. We also in Martha's LSTA testimony raised the technical amendments to the LSTA which would reestablish a quorum as a majority of the members currently holding appointments, and again, if the Senate decides to take action on those technical amendments, which Kennedy staff had indicated they were favorable to when we had met with them before, that would also send a signal to the White House by their enacting the technical amendments that they wanted us to continue and solve the quorum problem.

MS. GOULD: Are other people getting a buzz?

MS. CHALLINOR: We did, yes.

MS. RUSSELL: It came and went, hopefully. All

MS. GOULD: All right, I guess -- this is Martha. I guess at this point there isn't really much more we can say about the nomination of new commissioners, so there's nothing we can do until we know the status of our budget and, as I said, Bob indicated and Judy indicated the tea leaves are not telling us anything.

MS. CHALLINOR: I would like to say one more thing -- it's Joan. Should we be keeping in touch with the people who have said that they would like to be on the commission? Should we be keeping in touch with them? Should I be keeping in touch with Mrs. Purdue, for instance?

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. I would say absolutely, yes.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob. I think there is no force more powerful than those

individuals and I have been sharing with them the same information that-- for example, the note that I sent out earlier this week went to every single one of the potentials that I am aware of.

MS. CHALLINOR: Which note?

MR. WILLARD: The one that described the current status on the budget.

MS. GOULD: There was an e-mail.

MS. CHALLINOR: I got it, but I get a lot of e-mails, and I wanted to know, okay.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Let's go on.

MR. WILLARD: Martha, may I finish the thought? I think that personal contacts with them urging them to use what political muscle they have-- for example, we've got someone out of Wisconsin who has got real strong support from the former Governor, now Secretary of HHS. We have someone in Michigan, obviously, who the Governor Michigan is a strong supporter of, so clearly there is a subtle-- maybe it's not so subtle.

If someone is saying to the political establishment that I want to be on this commission, and they're getting political support, those political supporters have to not simply say, yeah, this is a good person, but yeah, this is a good commission, this commission needs to continue, and they have to understand that, and they have to articulate it, and perhaps we haven't been doing as well as we can at getting that message into the hands of the potentials.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. That is something that we can go back and I believe address.

MR. WILLARD: That is something that would best come from members of the commission, too, from people who have gone through the process themselves and have some political smarts.

MS. GOULD: Okay. This is Martha. Are there any other comments on the issue of the nomination of new commissioners? If not, let's go onto Museum and Library Services Act reauthorization.

MR. WILLARD: This is on a very fast track. Apparently - not apparently, definitely the House has moved it quickly and reported it out. I anticipated actually to see some action this week, and I've not, but I would not be surprised if the bill goes through the House on suspension. I think the Senate now has had hearings. Those hearings were described in the Congressional Record yesterday as the committee concluded its hearings. They started and concluded in the same session.

We sought an opportunity to testify in person there, but because of the press of time for the committee, they had another hearing later that same day, they asked that we not, and instead submit testimony, which we did, and it was distributed to you, I guess, on Monday.

There weren't any indications on the speed with which the Senate plans to move, but with the high degree of support that was articulated by the three Senators who were attending the committee hearing I would say that, and also because they represented both sides of the political aisle, I don't think there will be any delay. The position we took just very briefly was that the overarching important issue is to get the legislation through, and if it is noncontroversial, as is reported, we can live with that.

We did discuss whether or not there was a necessity for the new single advisory board. Bob Martin took a strong stand in favor of it. It doesn't hurt us at all if the law goes back to the status quo ante September 1996 and we no longer have a formal assigned responsibility to provide advice, because our statute still gives us all the authority we need to provide advice to any agency, including IMLS.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Bob, in terms of the bill going through the House, Congressman Gibbons, when I saw him just before I went to Afghanistan, told me that anything he could do to expedite, please let him know, and so I was wondering as we continued to work with Amy, and what about a Dear Colleague letter?

MR. WILLARD: I think it should be noted that, thanks to your contact with him, he did sign on as one of the cosponsors of the legislation. If the bill is going through on a suspension, which means limited debate, no amendments, and I think a two-thirds vote required for passage. It is a pretty strong indication that a Dear Colleague saying support this bill is not necessary, because the leadership just wouldn't put a bill up that they thought couldn't pass.

However, it may be worth conversation about, just as we did with testimony on the Senate side, establishing for the record that there are certain things that do need to be addressed in terms of the importance of the commission, and if he's willing to do that there at least is an opportunity to speak on the floor, and each side gets 30 minutes for debate usually under suspension, and just for the record, indicate his support just as he did at the appropriations hearing for the continuation of the commission.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Why don't you go ahead and contact Amy and work with his office?

MR. WILLARD: And also with the committee, to find out how quickly they anticipate the bill will be moving.

MS. GOULD: Are there any other comments or concerns?

MR. TABB: This is Winston. I would like to ask a question about the political strategy here as to whether there wouldn't be a possible assumption that if this bill does pass as it is now put before the Congress, that this would tend to undermine the need for the perpetuation of this commission. I would think that it would, that it would give the administration quite a handy lever to say, we already now have a different kind of board that is advising the Government on library issues.

MS. BINGHAM: This is Rebecca. It's hard to hear you.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob. Winston suggests passage of this would undermine our continuation because it would be possible to point to another body that would be advising the Government on library issues, but that's wrong, because the body would only be advising the director of ILMS on the Federal support for libraries on programs under their jurisdiction. It would not have the broader mandate which we still maintain by our permanent authorization under public law 91-345, so it will be confusing.

I think the tenor of our testimony says essentially it's not needed. This very complex new structure doesn't need to be put together when there already is an existing mechanism that thus far has worked adequately. I don't think -- we certainly can't point to great accomplishments in terms of our involvement, but clearly the original draft, the original guidelines for the leadership grant programs certainly benefitted from the involvement that the commission and the museum board together had, so we could make the case, but in this case there definitely is a subtlety.

The Republicans in the House who were driving this bill were between a rock and a hard place in whether to take a stand on the commission. If they simply reauthorized the law as is, they were, de facto, endorsing the existence of the commission. By taking away only - and let's remember, this is the committee and subcommittee that has jurisdiction over this commission, so they could have done anything they wanted. They could have written one line in there saying, public law 91-345 is hereby repealed if they wanted to do that.

They clearly didn't want to do that. They wanted to walk a narrow path that said we're not going to contradict the administration, but we still want the commission to go forward.

MR. TABB: This is Winston speaking. I appreciate this clarification. I think what this thing tell us is that the focus of the commission now needs to be on showing the complementarity between the commission and this new board, and we need to be sure we get our talking points in order to make clear that while there's not overlap, in fact that's true, because this will be very true to the continuation, I should think, and as you point out, Bob, it's possible to be very confused about how these two things relate for people who don't take time to really understand. This is very easy for them to see the distinction.

MS. RUSSELL: This is Judy. Bob Martin responded to a question at the hearing, and he was quite articulate about describing how the board would work and how its focus would be specific to its agency, and so I think when we get the hearing transcript that we will be able to take some language from his statement that will help to clarify that.

MS. BINGHAM: This is Rebecca Bingham speaking. When I write to Mitch and Ann or call their office, should I mention this very matter you just discussed and, if so, would somebody please write it simply for me so that I can casually mention it to them?

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Bob, why don't you list from the testimony that I gave -- there were a couple of paragraphs that addressed that, that were pretty clear, and make sure that

it is highlighted to Rebecca.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you very much.

MR. WILLARD: Will do. Any other questions on the authorization?

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Let's go on to commission personnel, then.

MS. CHALLINOR: One more thing about ILMS. This new body of 22 people is still only advisory.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. That is correct.

MS. CHALLINOR: So they are advisory, and we are advisory. I congratulate IMLS at being able to take so much advice.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. With that, let's go on to commission personnel.

MR. WILLARD: Just two quick announcements, and this is the first commission meeting since certain decisions were made to manage within the \$1 million appropriation, as opposed to the \$1.5 million that we had last year. That did result in our having to let go a full-time staff person. Our director of Communications is no longer with us, Rosalie Block. She left on March 31.

We also have cut back the receptionist position to half-time, although that job is completely vacant right now. We are using temps, but we're looking for someone. As you can appreciate, it is difficult to find someone who is willing to work -- we are suggesting we need someone in every single day, but only for 4 hours, and so we are working on that now.

And we also have changed Woody Horton's assignment from -- he was working on both Government information and international information issues. We have relieved him of any responsibilities in the Government information area and cut him back to 12 hours a week, and working specifically on information issues, and specifically the Conference on Information Literacy, which we will talk about later.

MS. CHALLINOR: Does that mean that the telephone will be answered only 4 hours a day?

MR. WILLARD: No. We all pitch in and whoever hears it answers it, and it does have backup with voice mail, but all of us try to, if we notice it ringing, whoever grabs it first. At any one time there could be a maximum of six people in here, but more often, because of hearings and time off and so on, we generally are seeing two or three.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha, Bob. It's also my understanding that because of the Fulbright appointment that Woody has, that he will no longer be with us after a date sometime in June, is that correct?

MR. WILLARD: The causality is not there, but yes, he will no longer be with us after June.

MS. CHALLINOR: At all?

MR. WILLARD: At all, except on a project basis if we need to bring him in.

MS. CHALLINOR: What happens after June on the information literacy?

MR. WILLARD: Well, to the extent that it looks like we will be moving forward on it, we still won't have any information on funding. It will just be one more job that Judy and I and Denise will cover.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha, Bob. Are there any other comments in terms of personnel?

MR. WILLARD: No. Any questions?

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes. I think that we have -- has somebody sent a letter to Rosalie thanking her for her service?

MS. RUSSELL: Martha did.

MS. GOULD: Yes, I did, and I also personally spoke with her.

Okay, this is Martha, Bob. Would you go now please to program reports, and the first is Trust and Terror, and that would be Joan and José.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I think you all know we've received some generally positive reaction to the Trust and Terror presentation. We have made some minor modifications to both, the presentation of the text that accompanied the presentation as we went through. I don't know where we are on trying to involve a well-known voice to provide some narration.

MR. WILLARD: Jack.

MR. HIGHTOWER: I'm here. I'm having trouble hearing José.

MR. WILLARD: She asked where we were with regard to enlisting a well-known voice, and you have the lead on that. Have you not had any success?

MR. HIGHTOWER: No, I have not. I have not been able to contact -- we had talked about Bill Moyers, and I haven't been able to get in contact with him.

MS. CHALLINOR: So where does that leave us?

MR. HIGHTOWER: Well, that leaves us where we were, and I don't know where to turn next.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. I have a comment and a question here. If, indeed, we're going to take Trust and Terror as -

MR. HIGHTOWER: Please, one at a time. I can't hear anything.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Martha, are you still there?

MS. GOULD: Yes. What's going on?

MR. WILLARD: Carmine, I think we're picking up the PA announcements from your flight.

MS. GOULD: All right. Are we all back together?

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, my question is, if Jack has not been able to contact anybody, does this fall into Bob's in-box?

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. What I wanted to bring up is something that José had discussed earlier, and that is the idea that we have pulled this program together, and we've got the program, we have the Power Point presentation, no, we do not have anyone as a narrator, but if we put this up on our web and make it available to anyone who wishes to use it, then they themselves could do their own narration, and what we have in effect done is give them a very good template.

MS. CHALLINOR: But Martha, we just got a letter from the White House, and what are we going to go to them with, a Power Point presentation on paper?

MR. WILLARD: What letter from the White House?

MS. GOULD: The phone call.

MS. RUSSELL: This is Judy. We also sent out late yesterday - I got a contact from somebody who had seen the Federal Register notice about this, meaning he had seen a description of this, who was with a firm that represents 25 local television stations here as their local Washington Bureau who was quite interested in this issue and in the idea that they might be able to tie it back to something in their local communities with their Governors, or libraries, or mayors, whatever, and I think we still have some opportunities we have not explored ourselves in terms of presenting this.

We have a tiny opening with Governor Ridge, we have an opening with OSTP, we have this opening with television stations, and it is a question of how, with our very limited dollars and our even more limited staff, and the amount of time the commissioners themselves can put on this, how do we take advantage of this and take it through to what we had intended, which

was a presentation to congressional staff.

MS. CHALLINOR: Exactly.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I think we have to be very clear that our role in this is really to focus at the Federal level in getting agencies to recognize libraries, public libraries as a conduit for getting information out quickly to local communities.

I don't think our role, as we had ever thought our role was going to be, we're going to do this and present something nice and polished and ask libraries to distribute it, so I think we have two things. One is, we can certainly make a presentation, and we should make a presentation available through our web site so that any library entity can take it or use it and take pieces of it, or take it in toto and use it for their own purposes.

MS. BOLT: This is Nancy Bolt. Can I comment on that? I've tried numerous times to download it from the web when it was sent to me. Maybe if it were on the web it would be easier, but it took a long time to download unless you had a really high-powered computer. The pictures come up so slowly, and when Judy presented at the Western Council she was familiar with it and did a good job, and there was no difficulty in putting the narrative with the web site. I think without a focus, I'm not sure it would be as powerful.

MS. GOULD: Well, it looks like we have to take it in terms of how we find someone, and maybe at this point we just find someone with a very good voice to do the narration.

MS. CHALLINOR: I think we have to get a firm who does this kind of thing. I don't think we can just get anybody. I think we have to get a firm who does this kind of thing, and I think maybe this ought to be numero uno for Judy and Bob to get this thing out, because if we go up to the OSTP and we don't have what we ought to have -- I think we ought to have a discussion of what we ought to have. It ought to go forward, and we should tell Bob and Judy that this moves to Number 1.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Where are we going to get a firm to do this for free?

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, is there no money to do this in the budget?

MS. GOULD: This is Martha, Bob. Would you like to answer that one?

MR. WILLARD: Sure. We can make money. We've already let one person go. We could let another person go, and we would be able to fund it with that.

MR. HIGHTOWER: We're going to have to find somebody who is interested in PSA's and get them involved, and I don't know how that -- if I am here, I don't have any entre to know who to contact.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Well, do you think someone, a foundation like the Benton Foundation - this is José. I was wondering whether there might be a foundation like the Benton Foundation

that might be willing to fund the narration so that we can produce this. There are two ways then that we could distribute it. We could take a look at distributing something on a CD-ROM, or we could distribute it on a VHS videotape. Both ways would allow us to produce something that is a complete package, which is something you're looking for, Nancy. It does mean you in a sense have the whole at that point, but that might be a good way to get it out. It is a large file, because it is so graphically intensive, and it will be worse with the sound, of course.

MS. BOLT: A CD-ROM is much cheaper than video.

MS. GOULD: Bob, this is Martha. I know that there are agencies that have people who you can hire to do narration, and why don't we go ahead and look into that and get some kind of a cost, and then sit down and look at what we can or cannot afford and where we might be able to get some underwriting.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob. One of the biggest mistakes we could make is where we have two initiatives going on at the same time, and since Jack was seeking Bill Moyers, it did not make sense to seek anyone else. Finding a voice is easy. I mean, the next person we had on the list was Tom Brokaw, and Joan has a contact with him, so making those sorts of contacts can be done. It's just that they have to be done serially.

Jack, if you're declaring at this point that Moyers is no, or if it's just that you haven't been able to reach him yet to get a yes or a no, we need to know that.

MR. HIGHTOWER: It isn't that I haven't been able to reach him, but the contacts that I thought would be available do not seem to be available, so I don't know how to reach him other than to just put in a phone call and say, this is Jack Hightower, I met you one time 100 years ago.

MS. CHALLINOR: But at the same time, if we do this, and we go serially on this, we're not likely to really get this in a timely fashion. I'm worried about getting this in a timely fashion. I mean, it was suggested by José, I believe in October. It is now April.

MR. HIGHTOWER: I think I mentioned this back the first time we talked about Bill Moyers. Walter Cronkite's daughter lives here in Austin, and he comes here to Austin fairly regularly, I understand. His son-in-law is a good friend of mine. I don't mind calling Bill Eickart, his son-in-law, and saying sometime if it's possible I would like to talk to Mr. Cronkite about the possibility of doing a public service announcement for the library commission. I can do that in the next 30 minutes. I can call Bill Eickart and tell him that, and I'm willing to do that if that is what you want me to do.

MS. CHALLINOR: Speaking for myself, I think that would be excellent. It is now quarter to 11.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Well, I don't mind using another phone and call him right now while you all are continuing to talk.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Go ahead and do that.

MS. GRIFFITHS: There are two other pieces to this, or perhaps three. One is the fact that we had at one point talked about a handout or brochure, and also that we had talked about a version of this for a library audience, which I think is from our perspective at the moment a lower priority, with all due respect, than focusing on the Federal level, particularly because of the OSTP call, because I think now that raises this to a different level, and it is an opportunity to get in to people who are obviously talking to Ridge and his number 2's in command, but a brochure is something we probably should take a look at, or think about, or a handout that is more than simply the paper version of the presentation, and again the question will be a budget question, because even if we had the time to produce something we'd then have to actually produce it in multiple copies, and there are going to be costs associated with that.

So I do think we need to have some strategy for what are the parameters and how much can we do, and how can we make something useful happen in the next few weeks, couple of weeks, really, that actually helps us achieve this purpose.

MS. CHALLINOR: I think that is my timetable too. We're talking about also a brochure.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. I think at this point what I would suggest is we wait to hear back from Jack, and I can recall when we did Kids and the Internet that one or two of us sat down together, and I think that I would be willing to take on the chore, if nobody else minds, of looking at what we have done in Trust and Terror and see if I can synthesize it down into a draft of what could be a twofold brochure, and then we would have something to look at there, because what we did with Kids and the Internet, we could do the same type of thing with Trust and Terror and then, of course, we have to find the money to produce it, and the bottom line is, we don't have a hell of a lot of money in this budget.

MS. GRIFFITHS: As I say, we can put our heads together and produce a copy, but are we going to have the funds to reproduce and distribute what it is we produce? I mean, that's the question. What if we produce one copy and we go to OSTP and they say, this is wonderful, send it out to the masses, or every Government agency.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob. If they say that, we say, hooray, and we remind them that Congress passed an appropriation with \$40 billion for defense.

MS. GRIFFITHS: We could consider this almost a mock-up, something that would be good enough just for sitting down for a couple of hours and producing some copy and passing it around and putting a couple of pictures in it and printing it off on glossy paper. We could produce that for a trifle.

MR. HIGHTOWER: This is Jack. I've got a report. I got through to his secretary and he's in the office. He's on another telephone conversation. I left my number and asked her to ask him to call me at his earliest convenience.

MS. GOULD: Thank you, Jack. This is Martha.

All right, let's think about winding up Trust and Terror and going on.

MS. CHALLINOR: I don't think we're finished Trust and Terror.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I was just going to say, Martha, do you want to have the first stab at copy for this?

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MS. GRIFFITHS: And then you could circulate it to us.

MS. GOULD: Yes. Judy, would you kindly Fed-Ex a paper copy to me?

MS. RUSSELL: Sure.

MS. GOULD: I have a printer that is slow as molasses.

MS. RUSSELL: I will also send you with that, Martha, a CD with that, so if you want to cut and paste you can do that.

MS. GOULD: I think I know how to do it, and I also have someone who can do it for me. Let's go on to library statistics and other research.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I hate to do this, Martha, but one other issue, OSTP had asked for a one-pager. Is that the brochure, or are we going to produce a second one-pager to respond quickly?

MS. CHALLINOR: Bob, are you going to produce a one-pager?

MR. WILLARD: Certainly. Essentially, it is a reprise of what we have done. It is not the message, it is about preparing the message.

MS. GRIFFITHS: If that were the case, I would like to add to one of the components I had put into the original letter that I sent to Tom Ridge, which is the notion of Government information and metadata for being able to coordinate, synthesize information from multiple disparate sources. I think that is something that we have, our disciplines have expertise on, but we could help pull together.

If, in fact, they recognize that they have a potential -- and I'm sure they do have a big problem in this arena. They may not have recognized it yet, but I do think that is a piece of it, and if you remember, we had a three-part plan originally, and if we could sort of say, this is what we've done, and at least point to the three-part plan, I think we have a little bit more of a message to get back to OSTP and Ridge than just the one piece.

MS. GOULD: Okay, this is Martha, Bob. You will work with José, then, on drafting this

one page reply?

MR. WILLARD: Certainly. I was going to dig out the original letters that were created and before they went anywhere José would be the key person to look at it.

MS. CHALLINOR: And that is why you are being given where I am in the next week, okay?

MR. HIGHTOWER: Let me interrupt. This is Jack. If I get my call through to Bill Eickart here in a minute, and he says, well, I would be glad to mention this to Mr. Cronkite, or have him call you, or whatever, what then should I say to Mr. Cronkite, that we have some text that we would like to submit to him with the hope that he could do a public service announcement for us?

MR. WILLARD: I wouldn't call it a public service announcement as such, because that has a limited --

MR. HIGHTOWER: What should I say?

MR. WILLARD: Just to narrate a presentation, and to make sure that he understands that it is something we are asking him to do pro bono, but simply to record a narration. We would give him the narration and the timing cues, and he certainly knows how to deal with that.

MR. HIGHTOWER: What is the text? I have to give him some hint about it.

MR. WILLARD: It's about 10 minutes long, and it simply deals with what libraries can do in times of emergencies and disasters.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Okay, what libraries can do.

MR. WILLARD: In times of emergencies and disasters, and we can get the text to you. We can fax it down as soon as this meeting's over.

MS. CHALLINOR: But I would like to make a point, if I may. Mr. Cronkite can certainly do this work pro bono, but we have to realize that he is not going to sit at home with a microphone. We have to provide the money for the production.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob. I think he probably could pick up the phone and call CBS and say, I want to come over and use a studio for 15 minutes.

MS. CHALLINOR: Bob, I think that's pie in the sky. I think that's pie in the sky. I think we would be getting ourselves into trouble.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Let's just say that basically I think we could probably dig up enough money to pay the cost of production, if that is necessary.

MS. CHALLINOR: I think that will definitely be necessary.

MS. RUSSELL: This is Judy. When LaVar did the audio piece for INLS, he simply sent us a digital tape that he had done. He took care of the studio.

MS. CHALLINOR: I think we can hope, but I think we have to be very realistic about the fact that we may have production costs if we ask Mr. Cronkite to do this and he says yes. I hate to rain on the parade.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Well, let me talk to him and see what we can do.

MS. CHALLINOR: But I don't think we can ask him to cover the production cost.

MR. HIGHTOWER: I don't think so, either, and I'm assuming, unless I hear a negative from Bob or Judy, that it comes out of the production costs, that we can figure out a way to scrounge around and find it. Can we?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Then that's taken care of.

MS. GOULD: Now, are we ready to move? Are we ready to move on to library statistics?

MR. WILLARD: We have distributed a report that Denise has prepared, and indicated that rather than going through that point by point she is ready to answer any questions that your reading of the report may have made.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Are there any comments on what I think is a very succinct and well-put-together report and update by Denise?

MS. GRIFFITHS: This is José. I would like to say that I continue to hear nothing but good reports about the work that Denise is doing. It is good to have an update. I just wanted to ask Denise, are there any statistics issues at the moment that are controversial?

I know that I had been approached by people who are participants in the ARL activity, and participants in some of the other library statistics activities about initiating some new alternative approaches to looking at library statistics, particularly in the digital library realm, that there is some dissatisfaction with the rate of progress in that arena, and I just wondered what your take on that was.

MS. DAVIS: Absolutely. There is a problem with the rate of progress. Unfortunately, the associations aren't solving that either. Part of what José is speaking to is some of the electronic methods and performance centers in the national survey process today, the only survey that has fully adopted the measures that were originally started by the International Coalition of Libraries, with the acronym of ICOLC, has in fact been entrusted through a series of IMLS

grants. In the library community the only national level survey that has been fully adopted is the State library survey, and neither ARL nor ALA proper have adopted those measures in total.

The surveys done by the Public Library Association have adopted some of those measures. The academic library survey that is jointly done with the American Library Association and the National Center for Education Statistics has also adopted only minor measures, so what I have done to try and promote this is, as chair of the Standards and Revisions Committee for the library's revisions standards, we have only adopted part of that, but what we're hoping to have ready by June is a draft standards.

The difficulty we're running into with that particular process is that NISO is meeting their standards out of the traditional formats into the base formats, and we are one of the test cases to do that, so we're now working with a program in College Park to actually set a standard, and the committee will have a -- a subcommittee was set up to deal with just getting the reformatted version of the former standard into this new data base structure, and we're having our third conference call next week, and we're still hoping to meet our deadline. At this point, what I'm hoping is that the libraries will use the NISO process for the standards.

I would also like to say the reason that it hasn't isn't because of the Feds. The reason it hasn't is because the State Librarians have not fully adopted these measures, and without their vote, those measures cannot be added, so there's still some concern at the State library level, and there's still some concern that it's not possible to measure, nor is it appropriate to measure at a local level, and until we actually test them, we won't really know, but to date there has been a specific push-back for the public libraries.

The State libraries actually will be reporting for the second time this fall.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Denise, is there anything that we can do, or need to do? Is there anything?

MS. DAVIS: Not really. It's really up to the libraries. Part of the concern, too, is that this is being worked on at the industry level, and that is the uniformity, and I'm very hopeful that the text that appears in the draft standard for the NISO library statistics standard will speak to those concerns. We've never had standard measures on anything, and I really think it's undergone extraordinary work, but it is a valid concern, and I take their concern seriously that we have 15,000 libraries out there that are sending different reports, and it is important to standardize them as soon as possible.

The commission has a presence through myself and through Bob on a number of committees, and Judy has been very active with the Government libraries trying to get the word out, and gotten entres for presentation, so we're doing our best to get the word out, but to the extent that - I don't know -- actually, what I would like is feedback. To the extent you could provide feedback that would be useful, but we're in a catch-22 at the moment, so until that NISO draft standard comes out we're in a wait-and-see mode.

MS. CHALLINOR: Denise, this is Joan. What does the statistics world think of NCLIS?

Do they think we're going to survive? Do they think we're going out? What is their view?

MS. DAVIS: The statistics world, I think they value the partnership that the commission has with the National Center for Education Statistics. Quite frankly, as long as the program survives, I'm not sure they care where it is.

MS. CHALLINOR: They would not be writing letters to the White House saying, goodness, how could you do this?

MS. DAVIS: It would be inappropriate for the State coordinators to do that. They report to the State Librarians. The Commission of State Librarians might be able to write that letter.

MS. GOULD: Are there any other comments or questions for Denise?

MR. HIGHTOWER: Other than to say thank you, Denise.

MS. GOULD: Thank you, Jack. That was about what I was going to say. Denise, as usual, you have done an incredible job, and it's much appreciated, and thank you for taking the time to come on to the conference call, because as I understand, I believe you're on vacation time now.

MS. DAVIS: I am, but I'm watching blue jays and robins, so don't feel sadly for me, and drinking coffee.

MS. GOULD: All right. With that, again, this is Martha, I would like a report on the status of the school libraries proceedings.

MR. WILLARD: Judy will do that.

MS. RUSSELL: Hi, this is Judy. The editor who was doing the work on the transcript and the submissions we received for the record --

MS. BINGHAM: We can't hear you.

MS. RUSSELL: Can you hear me now? I'll try to talk louder. I usually have such a loud voice.

The editor has returned to me her file of the close-to-final draft of the school libraries hearing record. I need to make a read-through. There were a couple of areas where, in looking at the transcript, she had the literal words people said but could make no sense of them, and so somebody who -- I may have to get back to members on this, but we have to sort that out, but the main thing that needs to be done now is to draft the foreword and send it to all of you, because that is actually the part of it that represents the so-what of what did we get out of it, what do we expect to do next.

Obviously, we can't say a great deal about what we're going to do next in the current

budget situation, but at least to highlight the principal findings which Martha has highlighted already in some of our testimony about the dire need for timely statistics, because the statistics we do have show a great correlation between a well-operated, professionally staffed library and student performance, but they're not up to date, and in order for it to be useful for policy developments at the State and local levels they need timely data, so it is on my list of things to do.

One of the things we will hope to come out of this meeting with is sort of a priority. I mean, obviously, the appropriation is number 1, the Trust and Terror is number 2. Where does this come in terms of the pecking order of when we get to this?

MS. CHALLINOR: Are you looking for us?

MS. BINGHAM: This is Rebecca Bingham. I think the sooner we make a definitive statement the better it is going to be for people to staff school libraries from the departmental levels and State levels. I think we need to make a very forceful statement, because the situation is getting so much worse than it was before ESA title II.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Well, this is Martha. I did comment on the school libraries issue in my testimony, and Judy, you can excerpt some of that, and we'll just move forward as fast as we can, given the staff that we have.

MS. CHALLINOR: I don't quite understand what we mean by making a forceful statement by getting our hearing out in a printed form. What kind of a statement are we thinking of?

MS. BINGHAM: This is Rebecca. I think we should send such things as that to the superintendents, and we should send them to our professional libraries group in each State and ask them to circulate it through their States to individuals to show it to the higher-ups in whatever their echelon is. Bob, do we have the money to do that?

MR. WILLARD: No.

MS. CHALLINOR: The answer is no.

MS. BINGHAM: Can I ask this question? If you would send out copies -- and I'm very active in the Kentucky School Media Association and in the Kentucky Library Association. I know if you sent me some brochures that I thought needed to be distributed, I'm asking, would the commission back me distributing them? I don't mind going to personal expense. It wouldn't be that much just to send it out, because the situation is so sad in so many schools, and the school-based decision-making is wreaking more and more havoc, and I would just love to take on the project for Kentucky and even Indiana. I love Indiana, too, but some of us get it out to somebody.

MR. WILLARD: One of the advantages we do have today that was not quite available 5 or 6 years back is the world-wide web, and the ability to put documents on the web in a way that

recipients can then download and reproduce hard copy at their own expense.

We know that much of the distribution of the Kids and the Internet brochure got out that way, because we did have a PDF and Acrobat file on the system, and people could make as many copies as they wanted, so we certainly intend to do that with the hearing as we have with almost all of our publications over the past couple of years.

MS. BINGHAM: This is Rebecca again. That sounds wonderful, just so that we get the identity of how to locate it on the web, and I certainly will be distributing it in the areas where I think I'm effective.

MS. BOLT: This is Nancy. If you also do a news release you can send out electronically to all of the State libraries where they can take it and distribute it within their States that they think is proper, and if there were a shorter brochure, which is also downloadable and printable, that might save you a lot of money.

MS. BINGHAM: I think some sort of thing ought to be said to the State Superintendents of Instruction.

MS. CHALLINOR: Do we have to wait for the hearing to be edited before we do this?

MS. BINGHAM: Can we just pull some good parts out of it and put that out on the air?

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. Yes. I don't think we have to wait for the formal publishing, but just as Judy, as soon as Judy has finished looking at what I guess we can call an executive report, we can move ahead to do something, and I will be in Washington in the next couple of weeks, and will sit down with Judy and take a look at this, because by then, hopefully, we will have the executive summary.

MS. BINGHAM: That sounds good.

MS. CHALLINOR: The executive summary does not exist, then, at the moment?

MS. GOULD: That is what she's currently working on.

MS. CHALLINOR: How long, Judy? How long?

MS. RUSSELL: I don't really have an estimate of how long. It is a case, as I said at the beginning, of the cue. I mean, the top priority is the appropriations, the second priority is Trust and Terror, if I'm going to be helping with the final editing of the Trust and Terror presentation and that brochure, these things all have to be cued up. We now have a staff of four people.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, that's why we're here. That is why this is going on, to give direction. That is what we are supposed to be doing.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, we can only have one number 1 priority. We can't have three or

four number 1 priorities, although we can have different number 1 priorities for different staff people, but that's one of the things, I think when we finish this meeting, and maybe that's most appropriate for the next Executive Committee meeting, when we have the input from this meeting, is to then try to look at how we balance this.

MS. CHALLINOR: You lost me. What is the input from this meeting that you would need in order to --

MR. WILLARD: How many number 1's are we going to have?

MS. CHALLINOR: That is what we're here for. That's exactly what we're here for.

MR. WILLARD: then we did lose you.

MS. CHALLINOR: But that should be done here now, so we're all together.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. It's my understanding at this point, just from the conversation, and it has also been verbalized that the number 1 issue is till, of course, the budget and monitoring that, and number 2 is Trust and Terror, and number 3 is school libraries.

MS. BINGHAM: I have a suggestion. If you have staff trouble working on the school libraries issue, I wrote the first standards, the new multimedia standards for school libraries. I worked on the editorial boards. I've written articles for encyclopedias. I would not mind coming to Washington and sitting down and honing this out to save your staff doing that, if you would just transport me and put me up while I'm there. I'm a pretty good writer.

MS. GOULD: That's a hell of an offer.

MS. BINGHAM: Well, I feel that deeply emotionally about what I see happening and what could be happening.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob. Let me clarify precisely what I think needs to be done. Number 1 is, we have an editorial product which is simply a well-articulated expression of what happened in Cincinnati last year, as well as all the additional material that got sent in subsequently, so there are two tasks. One is to write an executive summary, and an executive summary is just that, it is what happened, and I am not going to say it is trivial, because to be done right it requires a lot of skill, but there is a second, a much more complicated process, and that is to do what Judy indicated, the so-what? What is it that needs to be said about school libraries?

Well, clearly, Rebecca, you have a vast amount of experience and insight into all of this, so you could very easily, I think, write the so-what.

MS. BINGHAM: I would love to give it a stab. I'll give it my best shot.

MR. WILLARD: The issue that we have to face is, who is saying whatever the so-what

is? If we have a seven-person commission, for example, is it the policy of the commission? Do we issue it? I think we have to figure that out. What is the appropriate articulator of this? It may well be that we could say, here is a record, and one of our commissioners has an extraordinary record of accomplishment in the area, and it's coming from you.

MS. CHALLINOR: I'm not sure that that's even necessary.

MS. BINGHAM: Well, again, I can list the school library standards, the first one, information power, the original information power, I was on the Writing Committee for that, and then, of course, they have information power now, too, but I was on the Writing Committee for information power 1, and it flew pretty good.

MR. TABB: This is Winston speaking. I understand that Rebecca -- and I appreciate it very much, but I think the point that Joan was making is that this would be even more powerful if it came as a statement from the commission.

MS. BINGHAM: Well, if I write it, and you guys liked it, couldn't it be from the commission?

MR. TABB: I understand that, and I agree with you. I think the point that Bob was raising is, is the position, I guess, legally the position at this point, with the shortage of a quorum? Can we issue a policy statement at all?

MS. CHALLINOR: I would go right ahead. I wouldn't even pay any attention. If we paid attention to that kind of thing, we wouldn't even be meeting here today, and we could just close the doors. I say go right ahead and do it.

MS. GOULD: We could just simply call it, a document of advice, or advisory.

MS. CHALLINOR: I don't like advisory. I never serve on advisory boards.

MS. BINGHAM: Well, we can think of some kind of synonym to use, to get the word across without using the words. That would be legally wrong.

MS. GOULD: I think what we could do is similar to what we do with the Internet, is publish something that would be published as information.

MS. BINGHAM: We could say, information and recommendations.

MS. GOULD: I would say go ahead and do it and not worry. We have the Executive Committee that we have empowered to make decisions, so we will just do it. What are they going to do, put us in jail?

MR. HIGHTOWER: Absolutely. There's no use in making such a fine point about whether we have a quorum present. Let's act.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. BINGHAM: Well, my offer stands.

MS. GOULD: Well, I have news for you, we will be using your services.

MS. BINGHAM: Bless your heart, and I'll be preparing for it, you'd better believe.

MS. BOLT: This is Nancy. I'm in Pueblo, Colorado, and I have to go make a presentation, so I'm going to be leaving you now. I think one thing I would like to confirm is that we're hoping that Bob and/or Martha, or Joan maybe, will come to our meeting and give us an update.

MR. WILLARD: I have acknowledged that. You haven't gotten your e-mail recently.

MS. BOLT: That will be on Sunday afternoon.

MR. WILLARD: Yes. I just asked for a rough time.

MS. BOLT: Thanks for including us. This is a productive way to meet without spending much money.

MS. GOULD: Thank you for being with us. We appreciate that. We'll see you in a couple of weeks.

Okay, this is Martha. Well, it has been suggested we take about a 3-minute break.

MS. GOULD: All right, a 3-minute break.

MR. WILLARD: All right. Stay connected. It's 11:15. We'll be back at 11:18.

(Recess.)

MS. GOULD: This is Martha.

MR. WILLARD: We are back.

MS. GOULD: The next item is the International Conference on Information Literacy.

MS. CHALLINOR: I have not been told whether we've heard about any of the funding letters.

MR. WILLARD: We have heard zero from all of the foundation appeals that went out in December.

MS. CHALLINOR: Zero, or we haven't heard?

MR. WILLARD: Zero funding.

MS. CHALLINOR: In other words, we were turned down?

MR. WILLARD: Right. We have not heard from the State Department or the World Bank, and Woody did make an effort yesterday to confirm and still no answer. Our guess is that on the ATSECA money, because there's a brand-new person running that program over there who succeeded Ray Warner, that they're going to be slower than usual, and you may recall that in some past years that slowness has been as late as August or September, which is pretty rough when it's supposed to be spent by September 30.

But there has been some good contacts. Patricia Brabick went into a conference in Berlin. That's where she met the head of the foundation for AOL-Time-Warner, and she has been put in touch with a person within AOL-Time-Warner Foundation who has a specific interest in the types of issues that come up with information literacy, and I happen to know that head socially years back, so I've reestablished that connection, too, and have not heard back yet, but the bottom line is, we still have zero dollars that are in the pot that we know of, other than the \$7,000.

MS. CHALLINOR: May I have a copy of those turn-down letters?

MR. WILLARD: Sure. Woody has them.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, I would like to see them.

MS. RUSSELL: Could I add that the very one positive thing, though, that is going on, is that the papers are flowing in, and they seem to be by and large a very high quality. There is some of them that the content is substantial, but the English is somewhat lacking, and so we're working with an editor who is trying to help polish them, and we've also had some interest in getting the former USIA library, now called something else, information or resource officers who are helping them locally with their work, but whether or not we get funding and move forward with a conference, and we're still obviously determined to do that if we possibly can, we will come out of this with a substantial publication of about 30 papers that will be a very meaningful contribution, and that contribution was always intended to be a preconference thing anyway, because those would be the papers to be discussed at the meeting, and so we're working with UNESCO on a joint publication initiative so that it will get into all of the distribution channels.

MS. CHALLINOR: Where is the money coming from? Who is paying the editor?

MS. GOULD: The editor is at San José State University.

MS. RUSSELL: It's a graduate student at the university, and Pat has a modest amount of money which he is actually going to transfer to our gift account for the purpose of paying for some of the papers and for the editor. She is giving us \$6,000, so it will cover some of the paper

costs and the cost of the editor, so she is trying to augment the money that was set aside.

MS. CHALLINOR: How much are we paying these people?

MS. RUSSELL: \$500 per paper. It's an honorarium almost, not a stipend.

MS. CHALLINOR: As a historian there were times I would have been glad to get \$500 for a paper, believe me.

So that's covered. That is not coming out of the NCLIS budget?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, \$6,000 is covered. The balance was approved by the commission to be covered out of our budget.

MS. CHALLINOR: What do you think the balance will be?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, it was roughly \$15,000 for the papers, \$500 apiece for 30 papers.

MS. CHALLINOR: So that's \$9,000, and what is that coming out of, our budget?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. The Executive Committee approved that.

MS. CHALLINOR: I'm not saying who approved it. I'm just wondering where it's coming out of.

MS. RUSSELL: It's out of our budget.

MS. CHALLINOR: We already have it?

MS. RUSSELL: It's in the pot, as with all the money in the pot. It's fungible for one thing or another, but the Executive Committee had directed that it be funded.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes, because we've been talking this morning about paying for things for Trust and Terror if we have it. I just want to find out how many other things are in the pot that we might have to pay for.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, there's already a contractual obligation for these, because an offer was made to these people and they agreed to write the papers for the \$500.

MS. GOULD: If you look at our budget, Joan, you will see there's a line item for contractual services.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes, but that could be Woody, too.

MS. RUSSELL: It does include Woody. Not contractual, but the consulting services.

MS. CHALLINOR: Because just this morning, if Jack gets Mr. Cronkite and Mr. Cronkite goes to a high-class place to record this, we are going to have a budget problem.

MR. WILLARD: I will furlough myself for another month.

MS. RUSSELL: I think if we have an opportunity like that, where we can go to somebody and say we have the possibility for Walter Cronkite reporting this, but we need X thousand dollars to do it, I suspect there are people we could approach.

MS. CHALLINOR: Who would you go to?

MS. RUSSELL: I don't want to sit here and discuss that at the meeting, but it's something we can think about as to where might we go for auxiliary funds.

MR. HIGHTOWER: While we were on the break I tried again, and he's still on his conference call, so I can be understanding, as someone who is on a long-winded conference call.

MS. CHALLINOR: I don't want to give us long-winded. I want to give us credit for coming right to the point.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Okay. We've just got a lot of wind, then.

MS. GOULD: Okay, enough of this tomfoolery. Are there any other comments to be made at this point about the Information Literacy Conference?

(No response.)

MS. GOULD: If there are no more comments, then we understand money is a concern and we will be watching the budget, and if we have to go hat-in-hand we may have to go, with hat-in-hand, begging.

With that, I would like to go to administrative matters, please, and the first item, future meetings and conferences, Bob, you're on.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob. The only thing we have definitely on the calendar is the joint meeting for the Museum Services Board in June, toward the end of the month.

MS. RUSSELL: June 27, I think.

MR. WILLARD: There is a question of how much of a commission meeting we want to have in conjunction with that. You may remember, the last time we did that we met both the afternoon before and the next morning. At this point, it is unclear what we would be doing at that point.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. I don't think we need to have a commission meeting, a formal commission meeting per se. I just don't think we're going to need one. I think we will

just go in and do the joint --

MR. WILLARD: I don't agree with that. I don't think it's an issue of whether we have a commission meeting. I think it is an issue of whether we have 2 days of commission meetings. We've already reserved the morning of the joint meeting to have the commission meeting.

MS. GOULD: Then we should be able to wrap up whatever business we have at that time.

MR. HIGHTOWER: We should still reserve the 26th and 27th June.

MR. WILLARD: Yes. There has been a message. I think it was arrival. Yes, we had urged or asked you to arrange to arrive on the 26th and to leave the morning of the 28th, not sooner than the morning of the 28th.

MS. GOULD: That is correct.

MR. WILLARD: We anticipate having an informal dinner of the commission on the evening of the 26th, and there will be the scheduled joint dinner of the two boards on the 27th.

MS. GOULD: Okay, and I will be coming in -- I'm coming in on 4 May so that I will be in town for the council meeting on the 5th, and then I'm coming home, I think, on the 8th, so I will be in town for Ledge Day, and then I do plan on attending ALA.

MR. WILLARD: I think we've already put -- we've sent out to all members of the commission the invitation that was received from ALA for attendance at the conference, but we also indicated that from the point of view of official representation only the chair and executive director would be traveling on commission funds, unless some additional mission came up that a commissioner would bring to Martha's attention. So far, Martha, you haven't heard from anyone?

MS. GOULD: No, I have not. José, would you be attending in terms of representing the School of Library Science at Pitt?

MS. GRIFFITHS: No. I have at the moment no plans to attend. That's not to say I won't be there. There could be some related business, maybe related to statistics, maybe related to publishing, but at this point I have no plans to be there, but if I do and have this on-business I will let you know, and that would be covered by the other business.

MS. GOULD: Okay, thank you.

All right.

MR. WILLARD: As usual, Martha, we have received invitations to attend other library conferences during the summer. I think in light of our budget we have to look at these carefully, but both ways. I think it is important to be as frugal with our funds as we can, but it is also

important to maintain the connections with these associations so that if we ask them for their help we are not a stranger, so I think you and I should have an initial conversation, and then perhaps the next time the Executive Committee is on the phone we should present some of the meetings. They are the ones like MLA, SLA, AALL, ARL. I think that's it.

MS. GOULD: You and I can discuss that.

MR. HIGHTOWER: This is Jack. I'm planning to attend the Texas Library Convention the 26th and 27th of this month in Dallas.

MS. GOULD: The next item, then, would be the financial report. You have a copy of the budget.

MR. WILLARD: Judy has prepared this budget, which shows that so far through March 31 we are at 50 percent of the year, and we have 46.84 percent of our budget left. Now, a couple of points should be emphasized. One is that up until the end of December we were operating -- although we were doing it frugally, we were operating under the assumption that we were going to be continued at the 1.5 level, so there have been some rather severe adjustments since that time, so clearly we are not at the same running rate that we experienced in the first 6 months that we will be at in the following 6 months, most notably the personnel actions that I talked about before, plus a tremendous cut-back in travel, because we will only be having one more commission meeting, and obviously this commission meeting is a lot cheaper because of the telephone instead of travel.

The other thing is a good news item, and that is that as a result of some extraordinary detective work on Judy's part we uncovered some expenditures in the travel area in the past, or rather, obligations -- that is, that commitments were made using past year's dollars -- that were actually not fulfilled, so that money was still available in our travel account, so much of the travel associated with the first meeting we had back in December has been covered already.

That is why the amount you see so far expended for travel of only \$7,000 is appreciably less. I think a typical commission meeting costs us around \$20,000, so we were fortunately able to pick up dollars that if we hadn't found them just would have disappeared after, I think it's 5 years.

MS. CHALLINOR: Congratulations, Judy.

MR. WILLARD: I'll turn it over to Judy and she can report on anything else she thinks is worth pointing out. I would like to -- I don't think we need to get into line-by-line analysis here, we have the Executive Committee to do that, but we're ready to answer any questions that it raises.

MS. CHALLINOR: I just want to ask about the \$400 expended in the gift account.

MS. RUSSELL: That was a cost for the reception we had in December. That's essentially all we spent out of the gift account this year. As Bob said, we're halfway through the

year, and we're about halfway through our money, which is where we need to be.

What we have not yet received is either the State Department money, which we already discussed, or the formal transfer of funds from NCES, which we understand the contract has now been signed by their principals. We had already presigned it, so within the next week or so that money will come, and that in effect does give us some additional discretionary funds, because they are paying us for some of the services we deliver.

MS. CHALLINOR: We don't charge for that, do we?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, we do. They are transferring to us \$190,000. Of that, some part of it we expend on external contracts and other out-of-pocket expenses, but the majority of that money actually is buying the service from NCLIS of supporting their program, and it becomes money that is available to us.

MS. DAVIS: NCES asked NCLIS to support certain contracts that are easier supported by the commission than through their own offices, and those are preassigned. In addition to those, the commission is supporting that program, so those are the funds that Judy is referring to that go back to the commission budget to pay them back, basically, so it's just those kinds of things. It's overhead, really, but there are certain funds that are already targeted for projects specific to NCES, and none of those that are in the agreement have been executed because we have not had a budget. We have not had a transfer of funds from them.

MR. WILLARD: And it provides office space.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: But again, as Bob said, unless there are some specific questions, which I would be happy to take, this was just a way to update you all on where we are and kind of how things are flowing, and you can see by comparing the 2001 column with the 2002 column how severely we are cutting back in a number of areas in order to make this all work.

MS. CHALLINOR: If I take my pencil and I take out travel, everything below travel in the obligations are fixed cost that we can do nothing about.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, the printing is somewhat discretionary, but we have budgeted for that on the assumption that we have the annual report of the school library hearing and some other things to do.

MS. CHALLINOR: So if you take that out, if you take out the fixed cost, \$170,00 for the rent we're doing, we don't really have a million dollars.

MS. RUSSELL: No. We have said, if you look at the salary increment of this, which is like \$625,000, or \$675,000, and then you add the rent out of our million dollars the vast majority of our money is already a sunk cost, and the amount that is discretionary is relatively small.

MS. GOULD: That is correct.

MR. WILLARD: And in fact we have also cut back on salaries, and we can do more.

MS. RUSSELL: And as you have time to look at it, if you have any questions at any point you know how to find me, and we can talk about things separate from the meeting as well, if you have questions.

MS. GOULD: This is Martha. I do want to point out, however, that the ubiquitous Department of Education has changed their software program, which the new programs are not working very well, and it has cost Judy an enormous amount of time and effort to be able to pull together the financial report because of what the Department of Education has done, and I think Judy is to be commended for having dealt with this.

MS. RUSSELL: We no longer can get a consolidated report from them that shows travel and all these other things, so what I've tried to do is cobble together this information primarily from our own records of what we think we have spent. Hopefully, that will improve over time, and it's also advantageous not traveling this week, because they launched a new travel system this week, which is not yet working very well, but we're muddling along and getting through.

MR. WILLARD: It's interesting, a couple of years ago -- this is Bob. A couple of years ago a pretty significant step was taken in terms of small purchase capabilities when the Government issued purchase cards. We think of them as credit cards, but this was a new move, and it allowed you to get out of much of the paperwork that was involved in purchasing paper clips and office supplies, that sort of thing.

Subsequently there have been changes in that program that actually make it more burdensome. We have to register. Where in the past you could walk into an office supply store with your credit card and make a purchase, now you have to preregister that entity before it will be approved.

I used to see -- just like at home you get your credit card statement at the end of the month. I used to get handed a copy of that by our two holders of travel cards or purchase cards, and I would go through it, and I would make a judgment that yes, those are reasonable, and I would sign off on it.

Now I have to do that on computer, but before I could do it on computer I had to have a 6-hour training program, and now I have to have another training program on the security systems of the computer, which it used to take me 5 minutes to review the credit cards, so the Department of Education may see a need to do this for its own security purposes, but it is creating a tremendous burden on the commission just in complying with the most simply financial activities.

MS. CHALLINOR: This is Joan. My question is, in view of the budget, is it pie in the sky for us to talk about spending any money for Trust and Terror or for the school libraries?

MS. GOULD: No, it is not pie in the sky. I think that it is extremely important that we do this.

MR. WILLARD: This is Bob again. I emphasize that what Judy says is that we are still expecting a transfer of funds from the Department of Education.

We have forward-funded Denise and Kim's activities up to this point, so when that money comes it will be available to pay us back, and then instead of this being a million dollars at the bottom of the budget, it will be a million plus that part of the NCES money which isn't precommitted to external operations, \$100,000 maybe, so yes, we have money to do additional things, the money to do -- the money is less of a problem than the time.

MS. GOULD: Okay. If there are no other comments or questions -- this is Martha -- about the financial report, then the status of the annual report, please.

MR. WILLARD: That was a project that was on the desk of Rosalie. She has gone, but before she left she handed off a draft that I have not had opportunity to really go into detail. I read an earlier draft and gave her feedback. I have not seen how that has been incorporated into the last draft she gave me. Judy and I had yesterday or earlier this week said, well, why don't we just clear the boards next week and we'll put that as top priority. I don't think it is top priority after listening to the earlier conversations of this meeting.

MS. GOULD: Any comments?

MS. CHALLINOR: That's a toughie. That's a chicken and an egg. We need that annual report to go to people with. Do we have it funded?

MR. WILLARD: Oh, yes. This is Bob again. It is a prime example of what I mean by the difference between time and money. If we had it, we could send it off to the printers today and pay for it. That's not a problem. It is in the line item called printing.

MS. CHALLINOR: How many hours do you think it will take you to do?

MR. WILLARD: 25 or 30.

MS. CHALLINOR: So divided between you and Judy is about 10 hours apiece, or a little more, 12 hours apiece. What do we think?

MS. GRIFFITHS: But isn't the question, do we want Judy and Bob to work with this Trust and Terror and the school libraries?

MS. CHALLINOR: That is what I am saying.

MS. GOULD: I know what my feelings are on this issue. However, I am waiting to get some feedback from the rest of you.

MR. WILLARD: We need to have consulting services from the guy who dealt with the loaves and fishes.

(Laughter.)

MS. DAVIS: This is Denise. Don't we have to have the annual report published by a certain date?

MR. WILLARD: It is the law. It is the same type of law that says that Congress has to pass a budget resolution by April 15.

MS. DAVIS: I guess what I'm wondering is, when you mentioned earlier about getting things up on the web, would it be possible to get it reviewed and up on the web and not published in paper?

MR. WILLARD: Again, that's the exact opposite. The minute we have something that can go on the web, we have something that can be printed. That's not an issue. It's the time that it will take to get a current draft into final shape.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Who is waiting with bated breath to get our annual report?

MS. CHALLINOR: it is when we go places that we hand it. It is not that they're waiting. It is our face.

MS. DAVIS: This is Denise. I've been asked since January in a number of meetings for copies of the current annual report, and I had to give them last year's. It has been awkward.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Well, let's do it, then.

MS. GOULD: Well, let's say this goes to the top of the list and we get it out.

MS. RUSSELL: Before the OSTP one-pager?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MS. GOULD: If that is what you feel is necessary.

MS. CHALLINOR: José says she's going to write the one-pager.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Would you get it written and get it into the office, José, and Judy and Bob will complete the annual report, and then you're going to send me the information and I will do some kind of a brochure or draft on Trust and Terror, and you will work with Rebecca, and Rebecca will work on the what-if in terms of school libraries. Okay, and we want to put a time frame when we get back to the office on all of our chores, by Ledge Day, by 15 May?

MS. BINGHAM: That's feasible for me.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I'll have the one-pager next week.

MS. GOULD: Okay, José. You have the one-pager next week, I will get cracking on the Trust and Terror as soon as you FedEx it to me, and I will have it in my hot little hands before I come to Washington. I will get it back to the office. I will do a turn-around in about a week or less, as soon as I get it, okay?

MS. GRIFFITHS: Sounds good.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

That's down to New Business, then.

MS. RUSSELL: I just want to call everybody's attention to the time. It's 10 minutes of 12. Our reporter has to leave at 12:00.

MR. WILLARD: I will make it very easy. I have a rather ambitious concept that is beyond the capabilities of the commission to swallow at this time, so I will defer it, and that's enough said.

MS. GOULD: All right. Thank you. Is there any other new business? The observers that we still have with us, we would be delighted to hear your comments. Would you introduce yourself before you speak?

MS. BRADLEY: This is Lynne Bradley with ALA Washington Office. Thanks for having us again. It's precious time you've got, but a couple of quick things. First of all, you've already talked about Legislative Day, and you're all invited both to the full 2-day presentation and Lobbying Day, as well as the reception on Tuesday evening, and you should have that material, and we welcome you.

The court case on SIPA has completed. We expect a decision expedited within the next 2 or 3 weeks, so there will be much more about that and how it relates to the e-rate. You talked a little bit about LSTA. It's our understanding that there may be a pre-conference between Senate and House staff to see if there would be an agreement by the Senate to take up the House version of the bill, which would again keep this on an expedited path.

There are many other legislative issues we are working on, on everything from dot.kids.U.S. to the appropriations and LSTA to the e-Government bill, and a number of different copyright areas.

With time running short, let me just suggest that at some point, especially when you're talking about international issues, there are a number of arenas, mainly in the international property area, but also in the hate speech arena in terms of international protocols and treaties and so forth that we might want to have some kind of a sidebar discussion. I know Winston and others are involved, but one of our goals here is to increase the communication among the

different players on international issues so we all know where we're coming from.

MS. CHALLINOR: That is me for the international. I will speak to you afterwards.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Any other comments?

MR. NEAL: This is Peyton. I've got 1 minute. Martha, I think Bob has probably shared with you the letter the SIAA has sent to the House Appropriators trying to weigh in on continuing the funding for the library commission. Several of my colleagues have told me privately that either individually or through their companies they were sending along letters. Only two have shared those with me. At some point next week I will try to touch base with Bob and Judy so we can coordinate further within the existing SIAA and some of the former IIA people who did not make the transition over to SIAA.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Peyton. That is appreciated.

MR. HIGHTOWER: This is Jack. Can I interrupt? I just had a call from Bill Eickart, Walter Cronkite's son-in-law, and he said, well, he was always reluctant, as a son-in-law, to try to make a contact with Mr. Cronkite or anything like that, but he gave me the name and number of his assistant and said that I should tell her that he asked me to call her and that I'm one of his oldest friends, and I said, Bill, I'm not going to say that, but I will tell her that you asked me to call, and just outline it, and so as soon as we hang up from this meeting I will call her and if I can make contact we will see if we can at least get it started.

MS. GOULD: Jack, thank you very much.

Okay, I think at this point I want to thank everyone for sitting with the phone to their ear or hugging a microphone for a 2-hour conference call, and unless there are any other comments or needs, I think we're about to adjourn. Bob?

MR. WILLARD: No.

MS. CHALLINOR: Thank you, everybody. Thank you very much for coming and being here and giving of your time. Thank you very much.

MS. GOULD: thank you very much for your efforts, and to José and Rebecca in particular, thank you for taking on these extra chores.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the meeting adjourned.)